

## REMARKS

This Amendment has been prepared and is being filed in response to the Office action of May 13, 2010 taken in conjunction with the above-identified U.S. Patent Application.

In that Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3 as being unpatentable over a newly proposed four-reference combination including U.S. Patent No. 7,218,405 to Aschenbrenner et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0196493 of Christiansen et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0008885 of Caldato et al., and newly cited and applied U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0100656 to Kuroki.

Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 4 as being unpatentable over a newly proposed five-reference combination including U.S. Patent No. 7,218,405 to Aschenbrenner et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0196493 of Christiansen et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0008885 of Caldato et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0190045 of Matsuhara et al., and newly cited and applied U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0100656 to Kuroki.

Following a thorough review of the Examiner's May 13, 2010 current action, and of the proposed new, large-stack-combination of references, including the new Kuroki et al. reference, applicants strongly re-assert their position of patentability of all claims over the now cited and applied art, taken as a whole, and additionally, in the context of recognizing the existence of certain typographical errors which appear inadvertently in the preambles in claims 1 and 3, propose herein modest, corrective, housekeeping changes in those preambles. More specifically, applicants propose preamble-text changes which clarify the fact that that applicants' method and apparatus are for handling exclusively *each PDF data stream* which is en route to a printer, rather than *each PDF image-only data stream* so en route. Somehow, the "image-only" language became included incorrectly in the claim 1 and 3 preamble descriptions of what applicants' invention first examines (by querying) to detect the presence of "image-only" data in such an en route data stream. This erroneous reference did not appear in the original claims, and its correction now clarifies the current claims in this case.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 3 are presented in this Amendment as currently amended claims. Claims 2 and 4 stand as previously presented claims.

No new matter has been introduced.

In terms now of talking about the newly cited and applied combinations of prior art references proposed by the Examiner in the most recent Office Action, applicants at the outset, note that, in the last Amendment response filed in conjunction with the prosecution of this patent application, they inadvertently referred to the Matsuhara et al. reference as having been dropped from application in rejection of certain ones of applicants' claims. This comment was made in error, but an oversight error which clearly has not affected the prosecution of this application, inasmuch as the Examiner simply has continued to apply Matsuhara et al., somewhat as before, to certain ones (2 and 4) of applicants' claims.

In the preceding prosecution history of this patent application, in responses filed to Office actions, applicants have thoroughly discussed, and do not repeat their discussions here in text, the evident, obviousness-supporting deficiencies -- individually, *and collectively (i.e., as a whole) as proposed in different combinations* -- of all four of the immediately heretofore cited and applied references, Aschenbrenner et al., Christiansen et al., Caldato et al., and Matsuhara et al., which the Examiner continues to apply, *augmented now in all rejection instances by Kuroki et al.*, in rejection of applicants' claims. In the present Action, the Examiner has not stated anything which changes in any way applicants' views about these four references which simply, as the Examiner now plainly recognizes, are incapable of being combined, that is the four references previously applied variously to reject applicants' claims, to make obvious applicants' claimed invention. The truth of this assertion is clearly agreed to by the Examiner by the very simple fact that all claims now presented in the application, in terms of the Examiner's current Office Action, are rejected, in each case, *by the proposed combination inclusion of the newly cited and applied Kuroki et al, a reference* -- a reference which the Examiner clearly feels must be combined with the other four references in various ways in order to sustain his asserted position of obviousness.

Applicants disagree that the addition of Kuroki et al. into the large mix of assembled references, which the Examiner now proposes make obvious applicants' claims, adds anything significant to the Examiner's position of claim rejection. The Kuroki et al.

reference has a serious deficiency which disables it appreciably from being an obviousness-supporting contributor to the newly proposed reference combinations. This important deficiency is pointed out below. As a consequence, when one views the proposed, different combinations of references that the Examiner apply differentially to applicants' claims, with the combination in each case including the new Kuroki et al. reference, these proposed combinations as a whole are incapable of describing or making obvious the methodology and the apparatus set forth in applicants' claims. Put another way, Kuroki et al. does not mend the *reference combinational deficiencies* which the Examiner sought to overcome by adding Kuroki et al. throughout.

In looking at how Kuroki et al. fails to contribute anything, in the plural-reference mix as a whole, supporting a sustainable obviousness rejection of applicants' claims, it is important to recognize that applicants' invention is one involving a look being taken at *each PDF data stream which is en route to a printer*, to determine the presence or absence of PDF image-only data in that data stream, with that determination, when positive, dictating applicants' claimed deflection and channeling behavior for separate processing of PDF image-only data. A careful reading of Kuroki et al. reveals that a PDF-file data stream is interrupted in its flow en route to a printer, *if, but only if*, it appears to have a file size which exceeds the RAM memory capacity of the intended receiving printer. If the assessed file size is too great, a flow interruption occurs which triggers what is referred to as a *conversion process* -- a process that implements a form of file-size reduction in preparation before file transfer to the intended printer. However, a PDF-file data stream which does not exceed this RAM capacity, is sent uninterrupted, and as an entirety, to the intended printer. This operation is expressly set forth in the Kuroki et al. text in paragraphs [0073]-[0075], inclusive.

The portions of Kuroki et al. pointed to by the Examiner relate to conversion things which happen to a PDF file only (a) after file size has been examined, and (b) the examined file size has been found to exceed the mentioned, recipient-printer RAM capacity. These conversion things never take place unless file size is found to be excessive.

As a consequence, it is very clear that, in accordance with Kuroki et al. practice, every PDF-file data stream, including those which may contain PDF image-only data,

which data stream does not exceed the mentioned intended-printer RAM-storage capacity, will not be interrupted in its flow toward the printer, and instead will flow as an unmodified entirety to the intended, recipient printer. There is certainly no, initial PDF image-only data content isolation -- taught or suggested. By way of sharp contrast, in the practice of applicants' invention every PDF-file data stream which contains PDF image-only data is definitively interrupted from direct, unmodified flow to a printer, in order to accommodate dedicated, PDF image-only processing.

The Examiner's proposed combinations of references are clearly not aided by the newly cited and applied Kuroki et al. reference. These references, viewed as a whole, simply neither teach nor suggest applicants' claimed invention.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's newly proposed combinations of prior art references, cited and applied against applicants' claims on the ground that they support an obviousness rejection, do not, viewed as a whole, lawfully support such a rejection. They, given their significant, collective deficiencies, do not collectively teach or suggest applicants' claimed methodology and apparatus. For this reason, favorable reconsideration of this application, and allowance now of all claims currently presented therein on the basis of entry of the present Amendment, are respectfully solicited.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that the attached documents are being filed electronically via EFS-Web with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on September 8, 2010.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Pamela A. Knight

Respectfully submitted,

JON M. DICKINSON, P.C.



---

Jon M. Dickinson  
Registration No. 22,820  
Customer No. 52521  
8015 SE 31<sup>st</sup> Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97202  
Telephone: (503) 788-6774  
Facsimile: (503) 232-3127